

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 were pending in this application.

Claims 1-13, 15-17, 19, 20, and 22 have been rejected.

Claims 4, 9, 14, 18, and 21 have been objected to as being allowable but dependent from rejected base claims.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, and 17 have been amended as shown above.

Claims 1-22 remain pending in this application.

Reconsideration and full allowance of Claims 1-22 are respectfully requested.

I. ALLOWABLE CLAIMS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that Claims 4, 9, 14, 18, and 21 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the elements of their respective base claims and any intervening claims and to overcome a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 11 to recite a “polyimide layer” that is deposited over “at least a portion of [a] redistribution metal layer,” where the polyimide layer is etched to “leave at least one portion of the redistribution metal layer open to receive at least one solder bump.” These amendments are based on recitations contained in one or more of Claims 4, 9, 14, 18, and 21. As described below in Section III, the Applicants respectfully assert that these amendments place Claims 1 and 11 in condition for allowance.

II. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In particular, the Office Action asserts that the phrase “a portion ... circuit area” is vague and indefinite since “it is unclear as to what [makes up] the portion the integrated circuit” and “what [makes up the] redistribution metal layer.” (*Office Action, Page 2, Section 3*).

The Applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite “fabricating a redistribution metal layer over the at least one active circuit area.” The Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter regarded as the invention.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 112 rejection.

III. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, 15-17, 19, 20, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,441,467 to Toyosawa et al. (“*Toyosawa*”). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. (*MPEP § 2131; In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990)*). Anticipation is only shown where each and every limitation of the claimed invention is found in a single prior art reference. (*MPEP § 2131; In re Donohue, 766 F.2d 531, 534, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621 (Fed. Cir. 1985)*).

Toyosawa recites a semiconductor device that includes various layers, such as substrate 1, silicon oxide film 2, polysilicon film 3, diffusion layers 4a and 4b, CVD-silicon oxide film 5, BPSG film 6, barrier metal layers 8a and 8b, metal layers 9a and 9b, interlayer insulating film 10, barrier metal layer 13, metal layer 14, passivation film 15, and barrier metal layer 16. (*Col. 6, Line 18 – Col. 7, Line 52*). The semiconductor device also includes a gold bump 17. (*Col. 7, Lines 52-54*).

Toyosawa simply recites a semiconductor device composed of various films and layers (among other things). However, *Toyosawa* lacks any mention of a polyimide layer in the semiconductor device. In particular, *Toyosawa* lacks any mention that the semiconductor device includes a “polyimide layer” deposited “over at least a portion of [a] redistribution metal layer,” where the polyimide layer is etched to “leave at least one portion of the redistribution metal layer open to receive at least one solder bump” as recited in Claims 1 and 11.

For these reasons, *Toyosawa* fails to anticipate the Applicants’ invention as recited in Claims 1 and 11 (and their dependent claims). Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102 rejection and full allowance of Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, 15-17, 19, 20, and 22.

IV. CONCLUSION

As a result of the foregoing, the Applicants assert that the claims in this application are in condition for allowance and respectfully request an early allowance of such claims.

SUMMARY

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at *wmunck@davismunck.com*.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication (including any extension of time fees) or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVIS MUNCK, P.C.

Date: Dec. 29, 2009
/



William A. Munck
Registration No. 39,308

P.O. Box 802432
Dallas, Texas 75380
Phone: (972) 628-3600
Fax: (972) 628-3616
E-mail: *wmunck@davismunck.com*